

As a formal response to the Examiner's rejection of all the Claims 1-5, here is the following response:

- In response to the Examiner's objection to the Claim 1 being indefinite, and distinctly claimed the subject matter, in the 3rd sentence, ie : "said magnetic flux is transferred to each and every secondary winding--"
- The applicant believes that this functioning of this system is self-evident and intrinsic to the multiple coil geometry. The results of rigorous and extensive testing of the phenomena bears out the theory, so that there is nothing indefinite in the subject matter.
- In response to the rejection of Claim 2, the Examiner expressed the intention quite well, ie: "said secondary coils are magnetically induced an EMF from the single said primary winding by means of Oersted's magnetic flux surrounding any electrical conductors. This flux transfer action implies additional EMF output obtained from each of the secondary coils which is natural and intrinsic to the multiple coil geometry.
- The applicant believes the intention and definiteness of his art is self-evident.
- One area of uncertainty about this present art is the exact ratio of diminishment of the EMF from one secondary coil to the next. Although tests show an EMF diminishment factor and ratio, this has yet to be accurately determined.

In reference to the art of Davis, it is quite clear that the sets of primary and secondary coils are

one on one, that is, the multiple secondary windings each have one primary coil as the input EMF source. Nowhere does Davis disclose the coil geometry of the present subject art. As a further feature of this art focuses on the protective shielding feature for the transformer windings.

It becomes apparent that Davis has focused on conventional single primary and single secondaries in his sets of multiple coil windings.

His emphasis is also on the protection of the coil windings from environmental damage, as described.

Davis also discloses an electrode as a sacrificial element, all of which focuses toward the winding protection aim in his art.

The art of Chass is focused on the principle of a variable differential transformer.

It is clear that the art of Chass is specifically aimed at providing a differential voltage output in relation to the position of the movable armature, as shown and described.

It must be noted that the addition of multiple secondary coils to the existing Chass coils would **defeat** the true purpose of such secondary coils.

The present art specifically depends on producing a continuous and steady wattage output from each of the multiple secondary coils.

In reference to the art of Davis, it is quite clear that the sets of primary and secondary coils are one on one, that is the multiple secondary windings each have one primary coil as the input EMF source. Nowhere does Davis disclose the coil geometry of the present subject art.

As a further feature of this art focuses on the protective shielding feature for the transformer windings.

It becomes apparent that Davis has focused on conventional single primary and single secondaries in his sets of multiple coil windings.

His emphasis is also on the protection of the coil windings from environmental damage as described.

Davis also discloses an electrode as a sacrificial element, all of which focuses toward the winding protection aim in his art.

The art of Chass is focused on the principle of a variable differential transformer.

It is clear that the art of Chass is specifically aimed at providing a differential voltage output in relation to the position of the movable armature, as shown and described.

It must be noted that the addition of multiple secondary coils to the existing Chass coils would defeat the true purpose of such secondary coils.